

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-14 remain pending. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 7-11 and 14.

Claims 1-6, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,745).

Regarding claims 1 and 12, the Office Action asserts that "Although Suzuki does not explicitly use the term "embedded" when describing the tag10 [202], it is well known in the art that radio frequency tag (used for surveillance or other purposes) often is installed on the product such that removing the tag would almost always damage the product, if not removed by the authorized persons." Applicant has twice amended claims 1 and 12 to clarify the instant invention. As twice amended, claim 1 includes the limitation of "reading a tag embedded in the product to obtain product identifying information, **wherein the tag remains with the product throughout a life of the product**" and claim 12 includes the limitation of "a receiver that detects radiation reflected by a tag embedded in a product, wherein the product is being utilized for an intended purpose of the product, **and wherein the tag remains with the product throughout a life of the product.**" (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported in the originally-filed specification, for example (Page 7, lines 16-18):

Tag 202 is preferably embedded in the product itself as opposed as being attached to a package so that **tag 202 will remain with product 200 throughout the life of product 200.** (Emphasis added.)

Applicant submits that Suzuki does not teach or even suggest that "the tag remains with the product throughout a life of the product." In claims 1 and 12, as twice amended, the tag remains with the product and is not removable, including by "authorized persons." Thus, Applicant requests for reconsideration of independent claims 1 and 12. Moreover, dependent claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1 and dependent claim 13 is dependent on claim 12. Thus, Applicant also requests for reconsideration of these dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant submits that claims 1-14, as amended, are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons recited above. Hence, a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Dated: February 27, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By: Kenneth F. Smolik

Kenneth F. Smolik, Patent Agent

Registration No. 44,344

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.

10 South Wacker Drive

Suite 3000

Chicago, IL 60606

Phone: 312-463-5000

Facsimile: 312-463-5001